

LYNN H. PASAHOW (CSB No. 054283), lpasahow@fenwick.com
 J. DAVID HADDEN (CSB No. 176148), dhadden@fenwick.com
 DARREN E. DONNELLY (CSB No. 194335), ddonnelly@fenwick.com
 FENWICK & WEST LLP
 Silicon Valley Center
 801 California Street
 Mountain View, CA 94041
 Telephone: (650) 988-8500
 Facsimile: (650) 938-5200

Attorneys for Plaintiff
 INFORMATICA CORPORATION

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
 DANIEL J. FURNISS (State Bar No. 73531), djfurniss@townsend.com
 JOSEPH A. GRECO (State Bar No. 104476), jagreco@townsend.com
 IAN L. SAFFER (*pro hac vice*), ilsaffer@townsend.com
 ROBERT D. TADLOCK (State Bar No. 238479), rdtadlock@townsend.com
 379 Lytton Avenue
 Palo Alto, California 94301
 Telephone: (650) 326-2400
 Facsimile: (650) 326-2422

Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant
 BUSINESS OBJECTS DATA INTEGRATION, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

INFORMATICA CORPORATION, a
 Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

BUSINESS OBJECTS DATA
 INTEGRATION, INC., formerly known as
 ACTA TECHNOLOGY, INC., a Delaware
 corporation,

Defendant.

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS.

Case No. C 02-03378 JSW

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER ON REPRESENTATIVE
 CLAIMS**

As stated in the parties' Second Joint Status Report on Representative Claims, filed on June 26, 2006, the parties have agreed to a set of representative claims as described below. The chart below lists the representative claims in the left column and the corresponding claim(s) they each represent in

the right column. Some claims do not represent any other claim(s), and, therefore, the right column is intentionally left blank.

'670 Patent	
Claim	Represents these claims
1	
8	9, 10, 11, 20, 21, 22, and 23
12	24
15	13, 25, and 27
18	2, 3, 4, 16, and 28
31	30, 33, 34, 35, 39, and 50

'990 Patent	
Claim	Represents these claims
1	
4	
5	
8	
9	12 and 13

'775 Patent	
Claim	Represents these claims
11	1 and 9
5	4 and 6
7	12 and 13

'374 Patent	
Claim	Represents these claims
7	

The parties agree that (1) if a representative claim is found infringed and valid, then the claims it represents shall be deemed infringed and valid, and (2) if a representative claim is found not infringed and/or invalid, then the claims it represents shall be deemed not infringed and/or invalid. Proof of infringement, noninfringement, validity, or invalidity of a representative claim shall be deemed sufficient for that claim's represented claim(s). The parties agree that the selection of representative claims does not preclude BODI from asserting a defense of inequitable conduct based on representative or represented claims.

The listed representative claims will stand for purposes of summary judgment and trial. The parties' stipulation on representative claims is stated in full herein. If a disagreement arises over the effect or application of this stipulation, it will be resolved by subsequent agreement of the parties or by the Court.

Summary Judgment Hearing and Briefing Schedule. The parties have discussed counsel's scheduling conflicts over the next few months and respectfully request the following: (1) the Court schedule the hearing of summary judgment motions and the next Case Management Conference on any of the following dates: September 8, 22, or 29, 2006, or thereafter; and (2) the Court allow three weeks for summary judgment opposition papers to be filed (after filing of the motions) and two weeks for reply papers to be filed (after filing of the oppositions).

SO STIPULATED.

Dated: July 7, 2006

FENWICK & WEST LLP

By: s/Darren E. Donnelly
Darren E. Donnelly
Attorneys for Plaintiff
INFORMATICA CORPORATION

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

By: s/ Joseph A. Greco
Joseph A. Greco
Attorneys for Defendant
BUSINESS OBJECTS DATA
INTEGRATION, INC.

Pursuant to stipulation, IT IS SO ORDERED. The parties may each file a motion for summary judgment by no later than August 4, 2006. The opposition and reply briefs to such motions may be filed no later than August 25, 2006 and September 8, 2006, respectively. The Court HEREBY SCHEDULES the hearing on the parties' cross-motions for summary judgment for September 29, 2006 at 9 a.m.

~~PURSUANT TO STIPULATION IT IS SO ORDERED.~~

Dated: July 17, 2006


JEFFREY S. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE